



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/549,450

04/14/2000

Syed Zaeem Hosain

02556.P033X

8921

8791

7590

05/11/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/549,450

Applicant(s)

HOSAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Sujatha Sharma

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-34 and 36-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-34 and 36-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The applicant argues that the amended claims 28,37 does not contain new matter i.e. “the SID in the table identifying a cellular service provider that supports an application not related to voice communications”. Further, the applicant argues that the features of the claims 28 and 37 i.e. “performing a first detection process to detect support for the application not related to voice communication” is not considered new matter. The applicant argues that the specification on page 13-15 and page 41 have support for the amendment to the independent claims 28,37.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examples cited by the applicant on pages 13-15 and pages 41 is general in nature and do not necessarily and specifically relate to non-voice networks. For example, in vehicle theft scenario, the alarm triggers a microphone so that the operator on the other side can listen to the situation. Also the same communication network that is used for voice is also used to report the vehicle theft situation.

Further, the claims are not limited to the examples that the applicant has provided in the specification. The term “not related to voice” encompasses all such applications such as SMS, EMAIL, Instant Messaging, general alarm systems etc. None of these are disclosed in the specification.

3. The applicant argues that the secondary Reference Barber does not teach or disclose an SID in a table that distinguishes a cellular provider that supports an application not related to voice and further the applicant argues that Tendler also does not meet this limitation.

4. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Here, Lynch discloses a method where the first SID matches a SID stored in the SID table.

Barber reference is use to show the teaching where in case of emergency situation (see col. 2, lines 49-67), services are provided if any SID that are not on the preferred list is received by the cell phone meaning if low priority is determined not sufficient the preceding high priority SID is used.

Tendler teaches a method where the emergency situation can be triggered using non-voice communication for example by pressing a panic button. This teaching can then be used to modify Barber to invoke a SID that supports non-voice communication.

Therefore the combination of Lynch, Barber and Tendler meet the limitations of the claims 28 and 37.

Therefore the rejections of the claims 28 and 37 and the dependent claims as discussed in the previous office action and as submitted below is considered proper.

5. The prevailing issue in this case appears to be regarding the addition by amendment of the negative claim limitations consisting of application or service *not* related to voice

communication. While there is no *in haec verba* requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it. *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.*, 230 F.3d 1320, 1328, 56 USPQ2d 1481, 1487 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The Examiner does not question whether the claim language is inconsistent with, or contradictory to, the teachings of the specification. But, the Examiner maintains that the specification does not **clearly and concisely** disclose to the skilled artisan that the inventors considered this particular feature, *i.e.*, application or service *not* related to voice communication, to be part of their originally filed invention. There is therefore no force to the applicants' or affiant's arguments that the written description requirement was satisfied because the disclosure revealed a broad invention from which the later-filed claims carved out a patentable portion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amended claim recites the limitation recites "the SID in the table identifying a cellular service provider that supports an application not related to voice communications and further

Art Unit: 2684

performing a first detection process to detect support for the application not related to voice communication” if support needs to be detected quickly

4. The limitation underlined above is not disclosed in the specification and hence considered to be new matter.

5. Claims 29-34,36,38-42 are also rejected under 112, first paragraph since they are dependent claims on the rejected base claims 28,37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 28,36,37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch [US 5,586,338] in view of Barber [US 6,405,038] and further in view of Tendler [US 5,555,286].

Regarding claims 28,36,37 Lynch discloses a method for determining whether a particular service is provided by a cellular provider comprising:

- Reading a first identification number (SID) broadcast in a first frequency band where the first SID identifies a cellular service provider (see abstract, col.8, lines 5-14);
- Determining whether the first SID matches a SID stored in a SID table (see col.8, lines 27-29 and lines 48-54);
- Switching to a second frequency and reading a second SID broadcast in the second frequency if the first SID does not match a SID stored in the SID table (see col.9, lines 26-39, Fig.5);

Art Unit: 2684

-wherein the support for the particular cellular service is identified if the SID in the first or second frequency bands matches a SID stored in the SID table (see col.2, lines 23-32), the first and second frequency bands being cellular bands A and B (see col.8, lines 5-9).

Lynch, however, is silent to teach if low priority detection is sufficient and performing high priority detection process if low priority is determined to be insufficient.

However Barber teaches a method of determining whether support for the particular service needs to be detected quickly if neither the first or second SID is identified in the said table and performing first detection (high priority) process if support for the particular service needs to be detected quickly and performing a second detection (low priority) process if support for the particular service does not need to be detected quickly . See summary of invention, col. 5, line 15 – col. 6, line 4. Here Barber teaches a method where different priority levels can be detected and also with each lower priority level detected, SIDs of preceding higher priority level is not detected. However in case of emergency situation (see col. 2, lines 49-67), services are provided if any SID that are not on the preferred list is received by the cell phone meaning if low priority is determined not sufficient the preceding high priority SID is used.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Barber to Lynch so that the 911 emergency calls can be placed within areas where a new system selected is not available or if a new system is available and not listed on the SID list.

However Lynch and Barber do not disclose a method wherein the emergency service is activated without voice communication.

Tendler discloses a method wherein the emergency service is activated by pressing a panic button on the telephone, which is then interpreted by the network as a high priority call. Thus there is no voice communication in this situation when a panic button is depressed. See col. 2, lines 60-67; col. 3, line 60 – col. 5, line 35.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Tendler to Barber and Lynch so that the emergency service without voice communication can be placed within areas where a new system selected is not available or if a new system is available and not listed on the SID list.

3. Claims 29,30,38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch [US 5,586,338], Barber [US 6,405,038] and Tendler [US 5,555,286] in view of Evans [US 6,311,060] and further in view of Roach [US 6,044,265].

Regarding claim 29, Lynch and Barber as treated in claim 28 do not disclose a method of listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the particular cellular service.

Evans teaches that a control message is referred to as a page and SID is carried in the control channel (see col.2, lines 1-44).

Roach teaches a method of identifying the system identification (SID) by a NPA. Roach further teaches the method of updating the SID table after a page is sensed in the said frequency block. See column 4, lines 13-44.

It is apparent that Evans and Roach teach that listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the cellular service.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Roach and Evans to Barber and Lynch in order for an easy updating SID and informing the cellular set to add or remove the SIDs to the list.

Regarding claim 30, Lynch and Barber and Evans teach a method for determining whether a particular service supported by a cellular service provider comprising all the limitations as claimed. Evans further teaches if the cellular page is not detected in the first frequency band within a period of time, switching to a second frequency band (See Fig.9). Evans and Roach further teach that listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the particular cellular service (See explanation treating claim 29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Roach and Evans to Barber and Lynch in order for an easy updating SID and informing the cellular set to add or remove the SIDs to the list.

Regarding claim 38, Lynch and Barber as treated in claim 28 do not disclose a method of listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the particular cellular service.

Art Unit: 2684

Evans teaches that a control message is referred to as a page and SID is carried in the control channel (see col.2, lines 1-44).

Roach teaches a method of identifying the system identification (SID) by a NPA. Roach further teaches the method of updating the SID table after a page is sensed in the said frequency block. See column 4, lines 13-44.

It is apparent that Evans and Roach teach that listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the cellular service.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Roach and Evans to Barber and Lynch in order for an easy updating SID and informing the cellular set to add or remove the SIDs to the list.

Evans further teaches if the cellular page is not detected in the first frequency band within a period of time, switching to a second frequency band (See Fig.9). Evans and Roach further teach that listening for cellular pages having an NPA value in a first frequency band, the NPA value indicating that the cellular provider broadcasting in the first frequency band supports the cellular service (See explanation treating claim 29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Roach and Evans to Barber and Lynch in order for an easy updating SID and informing the cellular set to add or remove the SIDs to the list.

Art Unit: 2684

4. Claims 31-34,39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch [US 5,586,338], Barber [US 6,405,038] and Tendler [US 5,555,286] in view of Zicker [US 5,159,625] and further in view of Evans [US 6,311,060].

Regarding claims 31,39, Lynch and Barber as treated in claim 28 teach all the limitations as claimed. They are however silent to teach transmitting a page request packet in the first frequency band to a host across a cellular network and receiving a cellular page from the host in response to the page request packet thereby identifying the cellular service provider broadcasting at the first frequency band as one which supports the particular cellular service.

However, Zicker teach the exchange of data between host and a remotely programmable cellular mobile radiotelephone (CMR) (see col.5, lines 5-20 and Fig.1).

Evans teach transmitting and receiving a message/page in the first frequency band between the MSC and the home system and the message indicates that the particular CMR has registered in another cellular system and includes the SID and MSC number identifying the foreign CMR system (see col.2, lines 1-44, col.11, lines 3-27, 55-67 and col.12, lines 1-3). It is apparent that Lynch, Barber, Zicker and Evans teach transmitting and receiving a message in the first frequency band to a host across a cellular network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Evans to modified Barber and Lynch in order to collect billing information and bill the customer for using the home or foreign system.

Regarding claims 32,40, Lynch, Barber, Zicker and Evans as treated in claim 31 teach all the limitations as claimed. Evans further teaches updating the SID table to include a SID of the

Art Unit: 2684

cellular service provider from which the cellular page was received (see col.11, lines 4-27 and Fig.9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Evans to modified Barber and Lynch in order to facilitate roaming of the user to foreign system.

Regarding claims 33,41, Lynch and Barber as treated in claim 31 teach all the limitations as claimed. Evans further teach if the cellular page is not received within a pre-determined time, switching to a second frequency band and transmitting a second page request to a host across a cellular network, and receiving in response a cellular page from the host, thereby identifying the cellular service provider broadcasting at the second frequency band as one which supports the particular cellular service (see Fig.9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Evans to modified Barber and Lynch in order to collect billing information and bill the customer for using the home or foreign system.

Regarding claims 34,42 Lynch and Barber as treated in claim 33 teach all the limitations as claimed. Evans further teaches updating the SID table to include a SID of the cellular service provider from which the cellular page was received (see col.11, lines 4-27 and Fig.9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Evans to modified Barber and Lynch in order to facilitate roaming of the user to foreign system.


Art Unit: 2684


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
May 4, 2006


Matthew Anderson
SPE 2618